Peter’s Neg Strats

When the Aff runs a plan, they parametricize the resolution to a shrunk version. However, some resolutions are not written in such a way to allow counterplans theoretically. “Ought” and “should” indicate a future tense and talk about an act that is not happening currently.

How, then, can Neg run counterplans on this topic? Counterplans are a type of counter-advocacy, so they must have a framework justifying the fiat and explaining the counterplan’s function. Counterplans are essentially opportunity cost DAs. PICs don’t make much sense on this topic, and they often cause theory debates. Also, topical and untopical counterplans cause similar theory debates. Frameworks on these counterplans must frame the CP as an opportunity cost DA. Further, you also need a framework to explain how justice can be explained in opportunity cost DAs, meaning you probably need a value/criterion structure. If there’s no reason why the DA will happen in the status quo before repudiation, then the DA will lack uniqueness. Net benefits in CPs always need to solve what the AC solves but then also achieve some other end.